*UNITED NATIONS*

# SECURITY COUNCIL
## OFFICIAL RECORDS

*FORTIETH YEAR*

# 2606th MEETING: 20 SEPTEMBER 1985

*NEW YORK*

---

CONTENTS


| | *Page* |
|---|---|
| Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2606) | 1 |
| Adoption of the agenda | 1 |
| Complaint by Angola against South Africa: | |
| Letter dated 19 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17474) | 1 |

## NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . . ) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

## 2606th MEETING

**Held in New York on Friday, 20 September 1985, at 10.30 a.m.**

*President:* Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

*Present:* The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

**Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2606)**

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
   Letter dated 19 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17474)

*The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.*

**Adoption of the agenda**

*The agenda was adopted.*

**Complaint by Angola against South Africa:**
**Letter dated 19 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17474)**

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Angola, Argentina, Brazil, Cyprus, Guyana, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka and Zambia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), took a place at the Council table; Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. Sinclair (Guyana), Mr. Fall (Senegal), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka) and Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 19 September 1985 from the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour to request the Security Council to permit me to participate in my capacity as Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, under the provisions of rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, in the consideration of the item 'Complaint by Angola against South Africa'."

On previous occasions the Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

*It was so decided.*

3. The PRESIDENT: The Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in a letter dated 19 September 1985 from the representative of Angola to the President of the Security Council [*S/17474*].

4. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following other documents: S/17472, containing a letter dated 18 September 1985 from the representative of Angola to the President of the Council; S/17475, containing a letter dated 18 September from the representative of Brazil to the Secretary-General; S/17480, containing a letter dated 19 September from the representative of Botswana to the Secretary-General.

5. The first speaker is the representative of Angola, upon whom I now call.

6. Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): May I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for the month of September. I also wish to thank you for your assistance in convening a meeting of the Council, especially since this is a very hectic period for everyone connected with the United Nations. I also thank the Secretary-General for his efforts and the personal interest he has always taken in my country.

7. This is a time of rejoicing for the United Nations, a time for taking stock of the past 40 years, a time which will witness in the coming days and weeks one of the largest attendances of heads of State or Government, a time when the makers of history gather at the epicentre of internation-

alism, a time when chroniclers will record and historians judge the events of this period.

8. For the past months, countries in different parts of the globe, peoples of different colours, creeds and systems have observed or participated in national or regional activities relating to the glorious fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. And in the next few days and weeks, the attention of the world will focus on United Nations Headquarters as the Organization proudly commemorates the four decades of its existence. This sense of excitement, of renewed hope and quickening of the senses, is almost palpable, even in the corridors of this building and outside it, as the VIPs arrive and depart. A possible summit between the United States and the Soviet Union is a matter of intense debate, and even blasé, cosmopolitan New York City and its people are caught up in the moment. The friends of the United Nations are celebrating, and its critics are almost silent. It is a good time to be alive, to be in New York, and especially to be at the United Nations.

9. But there is a place where there is no celebration and no rejoicing. It is a place under attack, under siege, under bombardment by air and by land, a wrecked place where today's reality is war, death and destruction, a place where the United Nations celebration of 40 years of peace is a mockery, an event which would be satirical if the situation in which southern Angola finds itself were not so tragic.

10. On 16 September, the murderous armed forces of South Africa yet again launched a massive invasion of the People's Republic of Angola. What a tribute to the fortieth session of the United Nations!

11. The South African armed forces unleashed a new major attack on 17 September, with massive air raids and attacks on Angolan military units in the provinces of Cunene, Cuando-Cubango and Moxico, 275 kilometres from the border with Namibia. The racist attack was directed against FAPLA (*People's Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola*) units, which were advancing towards the UNITA (*National Union for the Total Independence of Angola*) base at Jamba from Mavinga, in the province of Cuando-Cubango, 255 kilometres north of the Namibian border and 180 kilometres from the border with Zambia.

12. On 19 September, South African Mirage jets raided the Mavinga area, and at present not only are the South African racists bombarding and raiding Angolan territory but they are also getting ready for more direct confrontation, on Angolan soil, with Angolan troops in the province of Cuando-Cubango, in the face of UNITA's inability to stop the FAPLA advance. Today's headline says, "Peace isn't Pretoria's top priority". The infamous Buffalo Battalion, made up of mercenaries from former Rhodesia and equipped with armoured vehicles, artillery and mortars, and also cars and other transport, entered into action with the brave FAPLA units. The Buffalo Battalion is aided by five additional South African battalions. Vast quantities of arms, weapons and other military equipment have been air-dropped by the racist régime in the Cazombo area, in the east of Angola.

13. There are no SWAPO (*South West Africa People's Organization*) bases in Cuando-Cubango and Moxico. These racist actions are intended exclusively to save UNITA puppets, who are unable to survive or have any type of military or political existence without the racist régime of South Africa. And the South African invasion has taken place just a short time after the South African régime sent a letter to my Government containing both threats and a proposal for a dialogue on the situation in the region. As my Government was considering a response, the racists sabotaged all prospects by their clandestine attack on the American Gulf Oil installation at Malongo, in the province of Cabinda.

14. The international community is surely not taken in by South Africa's weak and pathetic attempts to portray this massive invasion of my country as a pre-emptive strike against freedom fighters of SWAPO or as a follow-up operation to purported SWAPO attempts. These ridiculous explanations and pathetic justifications by the racist Pretoria régime would also be funny if they were not so tragic in their consequences.

15. It is a matter for some gratification that some of Pretoria's friends have deserted the racists; others have distanced themselves or fallen silent. A few have even come out strongly, officially and publicly, against the policies and actions of the Pretoria *apartheid* régime.

16. South Africa's rulers are today at war with their fellow South African. The foundations of *apartheid* are beginning to rock, and the ramparts are being scaled. South Africa is aflame with the fury of its people over a foreign, imported, imposed, artificial structure alien to the land and its people. South Africa is burning with the blood, anger and opposition of its people to a system they have never accepted and whose presence they will no longer tolerate.

17. Here one sees, lucidly and in sharp focus, the two aspects of *apartheid*—the internal oppression, repression and denial of human rights, the *apartheid* State's terrorism unleashed upon its own people, within its own borders; and Pretoria's outrageous military attack on the territory and the people of Angola, part of a pattern of similar earlier attacks and acts of aggression against Angola, Mozambique and Botswana—the external manifestation of that same *apartheid* ideology and practices, the *apartheid* State's terrorism unleashed outwards upon the sovereign States and peoples of neighbouring States.

18. It is vital that the Council and the international community see this link between the national and regional aspects of *apartheid*, the link between the pass laws of South Africa and the deaths of Angolan civilians hundreds of kilometres away across two international borders, the link between the disenfranchisement of South Africa's majority inhabitants and the sabotage of railroads, destruction of bridges and ports in Angola and Mozambique, the link between the high death rate of South Africa's black babies, the exploitation of black labour, the creation of the abominable homelands and the illegal occupation of Namibia and the destabilization attempts against

the sovereign, legitimate Governments in the region. These are all the manifestations of *apartheid*, as it originally sought to entrench itself and grow, and now, as it desperately seeks to survive in an increasingly hostile world.

19. On 26 September the members of the Council will hold their own commemorative session of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations—as well they may, being the "heart" of the United Nations machinery. At that meeting next week, will the Council take another close look at South Africa's record? This would be a fitting task and an opportune moment, since it is the Council that is charged with monitoring international peace and security and with admitting or expelling Member States.

20. South Africa was one of the original Members of the United Nations, one of those august few which signed the Charter of the United Nations in June 1945 at San Francisco. And it is South Africa which is today in contravention of many of the articles of the Charter. These violations are a matter of record, the subject of countless resolutions, including those of the Security Council itself. I will not impose on the Council the number and details of those articles of the Charter which Pretoria is guilty of contravening. Article 25 specifically states that "The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council". But may I be so bold as to suggest that, despite Article 30, which states that "The Security Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure", that is, it is master of its own rules, the Council is in violation of Article 24 of the Charter. Article 24 specifically confers on the Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and provides that, in discharging these duties, the Council shall act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. Those purposes and principles are among modern man's most lofty ideals—and I quote Article 1 of the Charter:

> "To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace."

What meaning do these words have for the dead and dying in Angola?

21. I say this in sorrow and in frustration. It gives me no joy to make these charges. But my country, my people, have a duty to themselves to protect their sovereignty and territorial integrity, to protect the rights of our people, to further peace in the region.

22. Where else shall we turn for justice, for redress, for compensation? And yet the one organ designed and created expressly for such situations has been largely blind to Angola's pain and deaf to Angola's cries. The source of so much tension and danger in southern Africa has escaped with impunity, beyond a symbolic expulsion from the General Assembly.

23. At this meeting the issue on trial is not simply the acts of aggression committed against Angola; it is *apartheid* which is under indictment. Your votes will be votes for or against *apartheid*; the implementation of your decision, in the form of a resolution, will affect *apartheid* in southern Africa, not just in the Republic of South Africa.

24. Now, on the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, the Council can show in a concrete manner what the United Nations is all about, and that the world is a better place because of the creation of the United Nations. Otherwise, our people in Angola might as well be in the middle of the third world war.

25. To those who have given their lives for Angola and who are even now facing South African guns, I have a duty to demand, as representative of a State Member of the United Nations, in good standing with the Organization and the international community, that the Security Council strongly condemn South Africa for its act of aggression, that it demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the racist armed forces from Angolan territory, that it adopt measures for the implementation of its resolutions on the question of South African aggression against Angola and that, in the face of Pretoria's continued violations of these resolutions, the Council consider punitive measures against South Africa, including action under Chapter VII of the Charter and expulsion from the Organization. Is it not time that the Council take action to restore meaning to the Charter and authority to itself?

26. As a State Member of the Organization, my country appeals to the Council, under all the relevant articles of the Charter, to come to our assistance. The continuation of circumstances such as those at present may leave us no option except recourse to Article 51 of the Charter, a right enshrined in the "constitution" of the United Nations itself.

27. The struggle continues. Victory is certain!

28. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of South Africa. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

29. Mr. von SCHIRNDING (South Africa): On behalf of the South African delegation, I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for this month.

30. Permit me to inform the Security Council of the circumstances leading to the situation that is currently obtaining in southern Angola.

31. In terms of the agreement reached between South Africa and Angola at Lusaka on 16 February 1984, South Africa undertook to disengage all its forces from the area which they had occupied in southern Angola on the understanding that the Angolan side would restrain SWAPO as the disengagement process proceeded, and would ensure that no SWAPO terrorists or Cuban forces would enter the territory from which the South African forces had withdrawn. The Angolan Government did not carry out this commitment. The territory was repeatedly violated by SWAPO terrorists moving southward to attack the civilian

population of South West Africa/Namibia. It is to no avail for Angola to dispute these facts. At sessions of the South African/Angolan Joint Monitoring Commission, these violations, 145 in all, were brought to the attention of the Angolan side, which admitted its inability to live up to both the letter and the spirit of the Lusaka understanding.

32. Nevertheless, in an effort to normalize the situation in that troubled part of the southern African region, South Africa announced on 18 April 1985 that it had completed the disengagement of its forces in terms of the Lusaka agreement in good faith. In order to stabilize the situation on the border, South Africa explored the possibility of establishing some form of joint South African/Angolan peace-keeping mechanism. Angola, however, refused to co-operate in any such venture. South Africa made it clear at the time that it would continue to take whatever action might be necessary to defend the inhabitants of South West Africa/Namibia against SWAPO's terror campaign.

33. Since the disengagement of South Africa's forces from Angola, SWAPO forces have returned to the southern Angola border area in ever-larger numbers and have announced their intention of increasing their attacks on civilian targets in South West Africa/Namibia. Despite repeated warnings to SWAPO, as well as appeals to the Angolan Government to control SWAPO's actions, there had been an increasing flow of evidence that SWAPO was intent on staging some major terrorist operation. Evidence of this was, for instance, the discovery of 124 kilograms of explosives at Katatura, near Windhoek, and a further 106 kilograms of explosives in the operational area, destined for use in South West Africa/Namibia.

34. More detailed information was obtained from two terrorists of SWAPO's Eighth Battalion, who, after their arrest, admitted that they were part of a reconnaissance and sabotage team. On the basis of their information, the tracks of at least 30 of these terrorists were followed to the border with Angola. A follow-up operation was immediately put into effect in southern Angola, where further large arms caches for use in South West Africa/Namibia were found and destroyed. The Angolan armed forces were advised throughout of the South African operation. The Chief of the South African Defence Force announced yesterday that the contingents involved in this operation have already been ordered to commence their withdrawal.

35. Regardless of the serious differences which have arisen between our countries, the South African Government remains willing to enter into serious and meaningful discussions with the Angolan Government as soon as possible. It considers such a dialogue to be an essential requirement for the peaceful and lasting resolution of the problems of our region, and particularly the volatile situation which obtains on the border between Angola and South West Africa/Namibia.

36. South Africa's action against SWAPO elements in southern Africa is, however, overshadowed by other developments in Angola. The central facts of the situation in Angola have not changed since the Council met last on this question. The fact is that in 1975 the MPLA (*People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola*) overturned the Alvor Agreement and deprived the people of Angola of their right to determine their own future in free and fair elections, which were to have been held before the end of October 1975. By so doing it unleashed the civil war which has wracked the people of Angola ever since.

37. South Africa has repeatedly stated that the problems of Angola should be solved by the people of Angola themselves. It has repeatedly called for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Angola. It believes that there should be no foreign interference from any quarter in the affairs of Angola.

38. But at this very moment the Soviet Union and the Cubans are directing one of their greatest-ever offensives against the Angolan people. Soviet and Cuban combat elements are directly involved in the fighting, and some of them have been killed or wounded. Soviet advisers have been allocated to each of the FAPLA brigades to direct the overall strategy of the campaign. They and their Cuban surrogates have deployed the most modern weapons against the Angolan people, including MIG-23 and SU-22 aircraft, M-24 and M-25 helicopters and T-62 tanks. Nevertheless, the people of Angola are resisting the offensive courageously.

39. The front line of freedom in the world today is in the savannah and forests of Angola. The question which will be decided there is whether or not a new form of imperialism will be permitted to take root in Africa, 100 years after the Congress of Berlin. Does anyone really believe that once the Soviets and the Cubans have consolidated their position in Angola they will allow themselves to be removed? Does anyone imagine that they will not then use Angola as a base from which to subvert the rest of central, west and southern Africa? Those who have any doubts in this regard should study the Brezhnev doctrine again and ask the peoples of Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Cuba and Eastern Europe for their opinion.

40. Where does the Organization find itself in this conflict? Does its concern for self-determination, free elections and human rights stop short at the southern banks of the Cunene River? Is it prepared to stand idly by while the Soviets and the Cubans extinguish the right of the people of Angola to true independence and self-determination?

41. It was on 27 January 1976 that then President Ford of the United States noted that:

> "This imposition of a military solution in Angola will have the most profound long-range significance for the United States. The United States cannot accept as a principle of international conduct that Cuban troops and Soviet arms can be used for a blatant intervention in local conflicts, in areas thousands of miles from Cuba and the Soviet Union, and where neither can claim a historic national interest. If we do so, we will send a message of irresolution not only to the lead-

ers of African nations but to United States allies and friends throughout the world."

42. And where do the leaders of the most powerful democracy stand today? On 17 February of this year, President Reagan drew parallels between what he described as the freedom fighters opposing Communist régimes in Angola, Afghanistan, Ethiopia and Cambodia and the *contras* seeking to overthrow the Sandinists in Nicaragua. He said:

"These brave men are fighting to undo the infamous Brezhnev doctrine, which says that once a nation falls into the darkness of Communist tyranny it can never again see the light of freedom."

43. A few days later, the American Secretary of State, Mr. Shultz, asked why, if Communist dictatorships felt free to aid insurgencies, must the democracies, the targets of this threat, be inhibited from defending their own interests and the cause of democracy itself. By repealing the Clark amendment, the United States has acknowledged the admissibility of rendering support to the democratic forces in Angola.

44. Will this commitment to freedom go further than phrases, or will the democratic countries stand aside while the people of Angola fight on alone against overwhelming odds? And what of the countries of Africa? What became of the strong support for FNLA (*National Front for the Liberation of Angola*) and for UNITA which existed in January 1976, when half the countries of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) had steadfastly refused to recognize the MPLA? Do they imagine that the ravenous tiger has changed its objective? Do they not know that, while they have been throwing stones at South Africa from their front door, the tiger and her cubs have entered their house by the back door?

45. Despite their speeches against South Africa in the Council, many of the African representatives who participate and will participate in this debate accept in their heart of hearts the truth of what I have said, because we, the people of Africa, have all suffered under imperialism. We know that Africa fears the tiger. We know that the African countries waited in vain for the West to help them chase it away. But they should know also that if they do not raise their voices now, they will surely one by one fall prey to Soviet imperialism.

46. There should be no doubt about where South Africa stands on these issues; it stands with all true Africans against the forces of the new imperialists.

47. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): Once again, exactly three months since we last met to consider a complaint of Angola against South Africa, the Council is confronted with another instance of blatant South African aggression against Angola. In this year alone, this is the sixth occasion on which the Council has met to consider one or the other of the transgressions committed by the Pretoria régime, be it repression unleashed against innocent people in an attempt at the consolidation of the repugnant system of *apartheid*, the continued illegal occupation of Namibia or acts of unprovoked aggression against Botswana and other front-line States. That, in itself, is a telling commentary on the intransigence of the *apartheid* régime, on the defiance it flings at the Security Council, the United Nations, and the entire international community—we have had a further demonstration of this in the statement we have just heard—and on the extent to which the Council's time and energies are spent in dealing with the threats to peace and security posed by Pretoria.

48. The representative of Angola has, with his customary eloquence and in tragic detail, apprised the Council of the latest instance of unprovoked, unjustified and brutal aggression committed by South Africa against the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola.

49. We are, of course, well aware that South African troops have for a long time now illegally remained in occupation of parts of Angolan territory, and Pretoria's professions of its desire for peace and coexistence in the region have hoodwinked nobody. The Council has time and again condemned South Africa for aggression against Angola and demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all its occupation forces from Angolan territory. The last such occasion was on 20 June this year, in resolution 567 (1985), following the dastardly raid on the Malongo oil complex in Cabinda Province.

50. Angola has known no peace since its independence in 1975, and South African aggression against that country has posed a continuous threat to it. Indeed, it is one of the many ironies of the situation that those who make so much of the presence of foreign troops in countries of the region should choose deliberately to turn a blind eye to the sustained, illegal South African military presence in Angola.

51. The Government of India condemns this latest act of aggression. Equally, the entire Movement of Non-Aligned Countries condemns the aggression once again being perpetrated against Angola. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the non-aligned countries—and, I might add, many representatives of non-aligned countries also—were in Luanda only a fortnight ago for the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, which was hosted by the Government of Angola. We were able to witness for ourselves the damage and suffering caused to Angola by the continuing pressure exerted by South Africa against it, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and United Nations resolutions and the commitments which the South African Government had itself undertaken. We were also able to experience at first hand the indomitable courage of the people of Angola and its Government and their unswerving determination to protect and preserve the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Angola against all attacks and threats emanating from South Africa. It is no matter for surprise, therefore, that the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries is united in expressing and committing itself to firm solidarity with the Government and people of Angola.

52. Notwithstanding the vain attempts made by South Africa to offer justification for this latest act of aggression, the facts before the Council are clear and leave no room for ambiguity. South Africa's action is impermissible and in violation of South Africa's Charter obligations. The pretext of so-called hot pursuit advanced by Pretoria must be rejected with the contempt it deserves. South Africa has no business to be in Namibia in the first place, to say nothing of its use of that territory as a springboard for aggression against independent African States. It is the duty of the Council, I submit, to censure South Africa.

53. I have just referred to the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Luanda from 4 to 7 September 1985. In the Final Political Declaration of that Conference,

> "The Ministers . . . emphasized the special political significance of convening the Conference in the People's Republic of Angola, a front-line State in the vanguard of the struggle against the abhorrent system of *apartheid*. They expressed the full solidarity of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with the Government and people of Angola on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the independence of that country, in their efforts to consolidate their national independence, preserve their territorial integrity and freely to undertake the task of national development" [*S/17610 and Corr.1, annex I, para. 10*].

In the same document,

> "The Ministers strongly condemned the Pretoria régime for the continued military occupation of part of the territory of the People's Republic of Angola and considered this an act of aggression against the entire Non-Aligned Movement.
>
> "They called for a complete and unconditional withdrawal of the South African troops from the territory of Angola and decided to increase material support to the Angolan Government, to enable it to consolidate its national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.
>
> "The Ministers hailed the Government of the People's Republic of Angola for its political will and diplomatic flexibility in the search for a peaceful and negotiated solution of the problems of southern Africa . . .
>
> "The Ministers strongly condemned, on the other hand, the duplicity and bad faith of the racist régime of Pretoria in its negotiations with the Government of the People's Republic of Angola as evidenced by acts of aggression, such as the recent sabotage attempt on the oil complex installations of Malongo in the Cabinda Province; and the attempt to supply large quantities of war material in Malange by aerial means, to the puppet and mercenary groups [*ibid., paras. 76-79*]."

54. The non-aligned countries have stood by Angola steadfastly and will continue to do so. The Council, too, has in the past stood by that beleaguered Member State. We hope that it will do so again, this time not merely by condemning South Africa's aggression and calling for its immediate and unconditional withdrawal, not only by once again upholding Angola's right to recompense for the enormous human and material losses it has sustained, but, most of all, by acting resolutely to implement its own decisions in that regard.

55. Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Council has before it an item that in the past became a matter of tragic periodic routine, when consciences were asleep and impunity was conceded by conformity. But today, when all the peoples of the world have finally come to understand the suffering and the hope involved in the South African tragedy, and when a universal movement of political and moral consciousness is beginning to mobilize the action of Governments towards the achievement of a definitive solution, this latest attack upon peace and security cannot be accepted or condoned. If it were, if we dealt with it leniently or with indifference, world public opinion, now so aware of the South African problem, would rightly demand that we go further in the search for effective sanctions in order to bring about the desired results. To that end, it is essential to determine, for example, the source of the weapons with which South Africa carries out its attacks. Who is arming South Africa? We have the inescapable responsibility, as members of the Council, to provide that essential information.

56. With the aim of doing its utmost to contribute to the triumph of justice and reason in South Africa and to close ranks with the countries that are victims of aggression, Peru a few days ago established formal diplomatic relations with Angola, and it is about to do so with Zimbabwe and all the other front-line States. The delegation of Peru is therefore ready to approve the most severe measures and to respond with the utmost rigour to the latest attack upon the brother people of Angola. The circumstances of that attack are such as to make it one more offence not only against that nation, the whole of Africa, the hundred non-aligned countries, but also against the whole international community, which today joins in a universal movement of repudiation of *apartheid* and condemnation of the acts of aggression resulting from the senseless attempts to preserve it, against the tide of history. The delegation of Peru therefore stands ready to support the action the Council adopts on this matter.

57. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour and privilege to address the Council today in my dual capacity as representative of Madagascar and Chairman of the Group of African States for the month of September.

58. Exactly three months to the day after the adoption of resolution 567 (1985), the Council finds itself obliged, in spite of itself, to meet once again to consider the armed invasion committed by the racist armed forces against the People's Republic of Angola and the threat that invasion poses to both regional and international peace and security. The facts have been described cogently and in detail

by the representative of Angola, and I shall not rehearse them.

59. As if the atrocities committed daily by the racist Pretoria régime against the black people were not enough, South Africa, in keeping with its policy of arrogance and disregard of the law, again invaded southern Angola on 16 September. The pretext given was that the invasion was carried out in order to pursue elements of SWAPO. In our view, that act of aggression committed by the South African régime constitutes an act prejudicial to international law and a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

60. It is ironic to note that South Africa, which undertook as of April this year to withdraw all its occupation forces from southern Angola, seeks to justify its latest act of military aggression by an alleged threat to the security of Namibia, a Territory that it is occupying illegally.

61. Such a justification, based on the theory of so-called preventive action, is unacceptable in the framework of positive international law. Indeed, acting as both judge and party in its consideration of a situation which it presents as a threat to its own security, South Africa has not hesitated to use force and to violate the territorial integrity of a sovereign State. Because of its vagueness and subjective nature, such a theory would permit any State to consider as dangerous to its security any action taken by its victim, even if it were in keeping with internationally accepted norms. That is the antithesis of the right of self-defence as recognized by Article 51 of the Charter.

62. The Pretoria régime wishes to divert the attention of the international community from its domestic difficulties resulting from the struggle of the South African people to dismantle the *apartheid* system. That régime is thus defying the norms of international law by violating the national sovereignty of the People's Republic of Angola and by launching an attack more than 200 kilometres deep into its territory from the northern border of Namibia. Those recent events show once again that South Africa, which claims to be the constable of southern Africa, is seeking to impose and institutionalize State terrorism to its own benefit while manifesting its scorn for the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

63. It is precisely the flagrant nature of this act of aggression which has aroused the reprobation of the entire international community. Even countries which are considered to be South Africa's allies have denounced it and have called upon it to withdraw its forces from southern Angola.

64. In order to discourage and pre-empt such acts committed by a Member State in violation of the Charter, we call upon the Council to act decisively by making use of the means available to it under the Charter. We are thinking in particular of the implementation by all States of the arms embargo imposed against South Africa in resolution 418 (1977); the recognition of Angola's right to appropriate compensation for losses and damage resulting from the acts of aggression of the Pretoria régime, which could be evaluated through an investigation by a fact-finding committee; and finally, the application of urgent, effective pressure against South Africa to induce it to respect the relevant Council resolutions and to meet its obligations under the Charter.

65. The Group of African States hopes that the Council will heed these demands, which are the bare minimum we can ask for in view of the gravity of South Africa's act of provocation and its harmful implications for the maintenance of international peace and security.

66. In this connection, I wish to recall that the most recent summit meeting of the OAU vigorously condemned South Africa's repeated attacks against independent neighbouring African States, expressed the solidarity of the whole of Africa with the front-line States, and recommended specifically that needed assistance be provided to the front-line States, including the People's Republic of Angola, with a view to strengthening their capacity to defend themselves against acts of aggression by South Africa. It also proposed the imposition of binding sanctions against South Africa and expressed the view that peace in southern Africa can be guaranteed only by the abolition of the system of *apartheid* and a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia.

67. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): Members will recall that on 20 June 1985, the Council adopted resolution 567 (1985), in which, *inter alia*, it strongly condemned South Africa

> "for its recent act of aggression against the territory of Angola in the Province of Cabinda as well as for its renewed intensified, premeditated and unprovoked acts of aggression, which constitute a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country and seriously endanger international peace and security". That resolution further strongly condemns South Africa for its utilization of the international Territory of Namibia as a springboard for perpetrating its armed attacks as well as sustaining its occupation of parts of the territory of Angola.

68. Today, after a lapse of only three months, the Security Council has been convened once again to consider another complaint by Angola against South Africa. In his letter of 18 September 1985 [*S/17472*], the representative of Angola drew the attention of the President of the Security Council to "the most recent violent acts of armed aggression committed against the people and territory of the People's Republic of Angola by the racist régime in South Africa", by once again crossing the Angolan border on 16 September 1985 and engaging in "acts of wanton destruction and brutality against Angola".

69. According to news reports—and, indeed, in the statement of Pretoria's representative this morning—the South African authorities have admitted that their forces have in fact invaded Angolan territory. The pretext given was that they were engaging in so-called pre-emptive

strikes from the territory of Namibia against the nationalist forces of SWAPO.

70. Namibia is not part of South Africa, and it is being illegally occupied by South Africa. One might then ask, what business do South African forces have in Namibia in any case? SWAPO, on the other hand, is recognized by the General Assembly as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. SWAPO forces are waging a legitimate struggle against the South African presence in Namibia in order to enable the Namibian people to rid themselves of the illegal occupier and to exercise their right of self-determination. All those facts are well recognized by the overwhelming majority of the international community. Accordingly, any military incursion or act of aggression by South Africa from Namibian territory against a neighbouring country, on any pretext whatsoever, constitutes a gross violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

71. Furthermore, South African actions are yet a further proof of South Africa's intransigence, in defiance of the relevant United Nations resolutions. Indeed, in South-East Asia a similar situation exists, which continues to threaten not only the territorial integrity and security of my country, Thailand, but also international peace and security. It is therefore patently clear where Thailand stands on the question before us.

72. Thailand has consistently, and in the strongest possible terms, opposed and condemned South Africa's acts of aggression against the front-line and other States, as well as its illegal occupation of Namibia.

73. Today, my delegation wishes to reiterate Thailand's steadfast position in this regard. We demand that the racist Pretoria régime cease its lawless acts and immediately and unconditionally withdraw its illegal presence from Angolan and Namibian territories. Moreover, South Africa must fully compensate the People's Republic of Angola for all the damage that the South African forces have caused, as well as desist from any further violation of Angolan sovereignty and territorial integrity.

74. It is also incumbent upon the Council to help ensure once and for all that South Africa comply fully and without further delay with all its relevant resolutions, including resolution 567 (1985) of 20 June 1985.

75. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Hardly three months have passed since the Security Council considered the aggression by the racist Government of South Africa against Cabinda Province in Angola, before that same racist Government committed a new act of aggression in which it used hundreds of soldiers and penetrated deep into Angolan territory, invoking the usual pretexts to the effect that it launched that action as a pre-emptive strike against the Namibian freedom fighters.

76. This new act of aggression against the territory and sovereignty of Angola is being committed at a time when the black majority in South Africa has risen up, calling for its legitimate right to equality, liberty and human dignity, and when a universal campaign of condemnation has escalated in an unprecedented fashion against the racist practices of the Pretoria régime.

77. Although such aggression is not new to the Pretoria régime, we cannot but wonder at the reason for renewed acts of aggression being launched at this very time, in spite of the internal revolt being faced by the régime and the condemnation of its practices and conduct by the outside world. At the beginning of this meeting, we heard a statement by the representative of Angola in which he answered these queries very clearly. He had already referred to these questions in his letter to the President of the Council, in which he requested an urgent meeting of the Council.

78. We in turn wonder whether the racist régime, by its latest aggression against Angola, seeks to demonstrate to us and to the world that it takes no notice of the denunciation and condemnation of its practices and actions and will persist in its racist practices and aggression at home and abroad. If the régime is attempting, by means of this aggression in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations to divert attention from what is happening inside South Africa itself, that attempt is doomed to failure, because such repeated acts of aggression only serve to emphasize the aggressive nature of the régime at home and abroad.

79. The aggression by the Pretoria régime against Angola and its racist practices against and brutal suppression of the black majority, in addition to its persistence in illegally occupying Namibia, all reflect the ideology of that racist régime, which has based its actions solely on the highest degree of violence in its relations with neighbouring States as well as its attempts to impose its abominable policy on the majority of the people within South Africa.

80. The delegation of Egypt would prefer to limit its statement, because the option before us is to take the necessary steps rather than to speak at length about that which we all know full well. Suffice it to say that the Security Council, in its resolution 567 (1985), strongly and clearly condemned the aggression committed at the time by the racist Government of Pretoria against the territory of Angola and the utilization by that régime of the Territory of Namibia as a springboard for that aggression. It also demanded that South Africa cease all acts of aggression against Angola and respect its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

81. However, this racist régime repeated its aggression on 16 September, and did so in yet greater strength. Will the Security Council still confine itself to condemnation and appeals, in the face of this blatant defiance by the racist régime of Pretoria? Each act of aggression by South Africa against its neighbours is an act of defiance against the prestige and authority of the Council as the supreme international organ for the maintenance of international peace and security. At the same time, that prestige and authority is weakened if the Council fails to adopt the measures called for by this continuous aggression.

82. Millions, not only in Africa but in scores of countries in the third world, have their eyes on the Security Council on the eve of the fortieth anniversary session of the United Nations. In Egypt's view, it is high time that the Council prevents its resolutions from being disregarded and sees to it that they are implemented. The Charter provides machinery which makes it possible for the Council to discharge that duty. We consider it incumbent upon us to show the racist régime of Pretoria the position of the Council on this aggression against Angola and the violation of its sovereignty, and to do so in such a way as to leave no room for doubt. The Council should adopt the necessary measures to force the racist régime to heed its resolutions and to respond to the appeal by Angola, the victim of aggression.

83. Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The racist régime in South Africa, not content with its brutal treatment of the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa itself, has constantly and openly committed acts of aggression against independent African States. Perfectly confident of its impunity, South Africa has once again committed an act of aggression against the sovereign State of the People's Republic of Angola. Once again, innocent people have lost their lives. A great number of people have been seriously wounded and a great deal of material damage has been sustained, as we were told today by the representative of Angola.

84. The attack on Angola is just one more link in the chain of misdeeds committed by the South African militarists and a further proof that the *apartheid* régime not only represents an inhuman system of racial oppression but also poses a constant threat to international peace and security. In order to eliminate it, urgent international efforts and action are needed.

85. There can be no doubt that this new act of aggression against Angola, like all that have preceded it, is aimed at intimidating the front-line States and forcing them to abandon their support for the liberation movements. On the other hand, as pointed out in the letter from the representative of Angola [*ibid.*], the expansionism of racist South Africa "is obviously designed to draw international attention away from the conflagration that is engulfing the racist *apartheid* minority régime in Pretoria".

86. This new act of provocation by the South African racists demonstrates that the ruling régime in that country is continuing to pursue its policy of destablization against independent African States. In so doing, the racist Pretoria régime is not only deliberately ignoring the numerous decisions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council with regard to the normalization of the situation in southern Africa, it is openly flouting the norms of international law.

87. At a time when the world community is celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and once again dedicating itself to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the South African régime is cynically flouting those very purposes and principles.

88. Such provocative behaviour by the Pretoria authorities and the defiant statement made here today by the representative of South Africa both are the result of the patronage and support that the South African racists have enjoyed and continue to enjoy from their powerful Western patrons—first and foremost, the United States. We can hardly attach serious significance to the limitations on economic ties with South Africa that were recently put forward by the United States Administration, since those so-called sanctions are accompanied by a host of qualifications and loopholes. There have been absolutely no perceptible changes in the essence of the United States position with regard to the *apartheid* régime, excepting that "constructive engagement" with South Africa is now being called "active engagement".

89. Once again, we are forced to note that it is that precise policy of the United States Administration towards the Botha régime that is one of the main reasons for that régime's increasing aggressivity, and that it has nurtured the régime's illusions of being able to act with total impunity.

90. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic vehemently condemns the new and unprovoked act of aggression by South Africa against Angola and declares its firm solidarity with the people and Government of Angola. We believe that the time has come for the Council to fulfil its duties under the Charter in a decisive manner, to adopt effective measures against the *apartheid* régime and, in accordance with the Charter, demand that it call a halt to its aggressive actions.

91. Events in southern Africa have disturbed people in many countries. International organizations have condemned the Pretoria authorities. Many Governments and a broad spectrum of public opinion in many countries throughout the world have done the same. Many international forums now being held have condemned the aggressive policy of the Pretoria régime; last week, parliamentarians of the Western European countries participated in a seminar held at Amsterdam and issued a condemnation of that régime. Appeals for a boycott against the South African régime have been heard this year in Bonn, instigated by the Green Party. There have been striking exposures of the role played by transnational corporations and monopolies in South Africa and Namibia, some of which were heard at the hearings held here at United Nations Headquarters. Last week in Hungary a representative international seminar was held at which I headed a delegation from the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. The participants at that seminar called upon the Security Council to bring its powerful authority to bear in favour of the restoration of legitimacy and order in southern Africa and to put into effect comprehensive and binding sanctions against the Pretoria régime under Chapter VII of the Charter.

92. It is difficult to find new language to condemn the aggressive acts and criminal policy of the *apartheid* régime

in words that have not already been uttered here, but we must search for such words and such language. We need active and concerted efforts by all members of the Council.

93. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Brazil. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

94. Mr. MACIEL (Brazil): I should like first of all to extend to you, Sir, my sincere felicitations on your assuming the presidency of the Council and thanks for allowing the delegation of the Brazilian Government to make a short statement here today.

95. As soon as the Brazilian Government was informed of the most recent act of armed aggression against the territory of the People's Republic of Angola by South Africa, the Brazilian Minister for Foreign Affairs sent a telegram to his colleague, the Angolan Minister for Foreign Affairs [*S/17475*], which I would like to read to the Council:

> "I have just been informed that the aggressive *apartheid* régime has invaded the south of Angola from the illegally occupied territory of Namibia. At this crucial moment in history in which there has been a flagrant and unacceptable violation both of the sovereignty of Angola and of the basic principles that govern relations between civilized States. Your Excellency and the entire Angolan nation may rest assured of the solidarity of the Brazilian Government and people."

96. In fact, the circumstances in which this last South African attack against Angola has taken place are crucial. While the entire international community is following with grave concern the cycle of violence spreading within the boundaries of South Africa at a moment when international opinion seems to be mobilized against *apartheid* to an extent never before witnessed, in a year when the Security Council has issued several expressions of condemnation against the aggressiveness of Pretoria towards its neighbours, the South African régime has retaliated by striking once again with brutal strength a peaceful country whose only guilt is the solidarity it offers to its African brothers.

97. No justification could be acceptable for the present act of aggression. Just as was the case when South Africa tried to sabotage economic targets in Cabinda, not even the physical proximity of a concrete menace to that country can now be alleged. Any violent act by Pretoria aimed at defending its position in Namibia constitutes a crime in defence of illegality. No excuse for pre-emptive strikes against SWAPO can be disguised by the notion of self-protection. South Africa's presence in Namibian territory is itself illegal.

98. As we approach the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, the total defiance by South Africa of the strong stance taken by the international community on the crisis in southern Africa should justify effective action by the Security Council. The recurrent acts of aggression against neighbouring States are not only a transgression of international law; we are hearing the cries of despair of a régime doomed to fail. In fact, that régime is being dismantled by the antagonistic forces its very existence tends to generate. We should not, however, fail to take concrete steps to make Pretoria cease its aggressive acts against Angola and other countries in the region. The United Nations has indeed played an important role in mobilizing international public opinion against the acts of aggression of the Pretoria régime, and we have to go further in our concerted action for the total eradication of the racist and violent policies of South Africa.

99. As a Latin American country, as a sister country of Angola, Brazil has consistently affirmed its solidarity with the Angolan people and Government, as well as with the people of Namibia. Several countries have already adopted, at different levels, sets of sanctions against South Africa. Brazil is one of them. Taken collectively, these individual actions represent a concrete contribution to the dismantling of the structure of an aggressive Government. Their reach is, however, limited. Effective measures can only lead to more tangible results if supported and adopted by the international community as a whole. We should not feel discouraged by the brazen attitude of South Africa in disregard of international law. Common determination and common deeds will force Pretoria to abide by the rules of civilized coexistence among States.

100. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal, Mr. Ibrahima Fall. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

101. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. Abdou Diouf, President of the Republic of Senegal and current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, I should like to convey to you, and through you to the members of the Security Council, our gratitude for your allowing me to take part in this very important debate on the repeated acts of aggression of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola. I am not merely following tradition when I say that my pleasure in so doing is increased by the fact that you are guiding the work of the Council with a competence and impartiality that is recognized by all on behalf of the great country which you represent here, the United Kingdom, with which Africa has special, long-standing relations based on mutual respect.

102. I also wish to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Oleg Troyanovsky, the representative of the Soviet Union, for the exemplary and responsible manner in which he led the work of the Council in August.

103. President Abdou Diouf has just addressed a message to the President of Angola which reflects Africa's disapproval and condemnation of the State terrorism practised by South Africa. I will now read that message to the Council:

> "The incorrigible supporters of *apartheid* have once again deliberately violated the territorial integrity and

sovereignty of independent Angola. This heinous act of destabilization, committed under the false pretext of "hot pursuit" of SWAPO fighters, constitutes undeniable aggression in the terms of international law.

"The segregationist régime of Pretoria has chosen the eve of the session of the General Assembly during which the fortieth anniversary of the entry into force of the Charter of the United Nations will be commemorated to show how little it respects the San Francisco document. Indeed, this raid against southern Angola rides roughshod over the spirit and the letter of the most fundamental provisions of the Charter.

"In these serious circumstances, the OAU, through me, reaffirms to the courageous people of Angola the active solidarity of Africa, which is saddened and revolted by such arrogance. But let there be no mistake—no acts of intimidation, however barbarous and wanton, can enable the *apartheid* régime to escape a truth which has been clearly established by history. As shown yesterday in Asia and more recently in this same southern part of our continent, the will and the determination of peoples struggling to conquer or safeguard their independence and dignity have been irresistible. The last bastion of denial of the rights of the black man will not escape this historical truth.

"I reaffirm to the brother people of Angola the determination of Africa to continue to give it its firm support and solidarity in its struggle."

104. The serious act of aggression South Africa has just committed against Angola is part of a context that is clear in its true dimensions. Indeed, faced with the resolute stand of the vast majority of the South African people against the odious and inhuman policy of *apartheid*, imposed in violation of all norms of national and international objective law and rejected by the community of States as a whole, the Pretoria régime has made of the state of emergency decreed since 21 July 1985 a situation of principle in support of which it has intensified repression against the legitimate aspirations of the South African people.

105. The international community has reacted by unanimously condemning that escalation, which is arbitrary and has worsened the situation prevailing in South Africa as a result of Pretoria's acts—a situation that was already a cause for concern. The Council itself, reflecting the general reproach, has condemned the establishment of the state of emergency. Far from complying and understanding that, as is obvious to everyone, the only way to preserve a viable future in southern Africa is the establishment of a system of equality, democracy and fraternity with freedom for all, the South African Government has preferred the relentless pursuit of the same policy of arbitrary massive repression, marked by arrests and deliberate assassinations against the anti-*apartheid* forces. The failure of that policy is obvious today, as is shown internally by the glorious resistance of political forces, trade unions and religious, student and other forces, and externally by the quantitative and qualitative increase in international pressure for sanctions against Pretoria.

106. Refusing to learn the lessons of history, South African President Pieter Botha, in a statement that had been awaited with hope by those who were beginning to wonder about his lucidity, has just reaffirmed his resolve to pursue application of the *apartheid* policy, thus showing that blind and bloody intransigence constitutes the only response of the South African Government to the martyred people of South Africa, to the peoples and the Governments of Africa and to the conscience of the world as a whole.

107. Externally, this policy of desperation and political blindness translates in occupied Namibia into the establishment of a so-called interim government, in disregard of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Externally also, with regard to the neighbouring African countries, Pretoria has established destabilization, aggression and invasion as principles of neighbourliness. Thus, after many others, the aggression against Angola which is now being discussed here shows once again that Pretoria is resolved to continue to defy the entire world, including the Powers that still harbour a slim hope that a glimmer of lucidity will come to the South African authorities.

108. Only a few days after the holding at Luanda of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, a meeting during which the most important group of States in the world expressed its active solidarity with Angola in the face of Pretoria's acts of aggression against it; only a few days after the decision on limited economic sanctions taken by the United States, Canada and the countries of the European Community; a few weeks after the meeting of the Security Council held at the request of France at which important measures were adopted that were seen by all those who continue to have confidence in the United Nations as conveying a formal warning to the Republic of South Africa; and finally, coming on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the San Francisco Charter, which is the fundamental basis of current international relations, South African aggression against Angola offers further evidence that South Africa does not and will not take into account any decision of the Council other than mandatory and binding sanctions in accordance with the serious responsibilities conferred upon it by the Charter of the United Nations.

109. The statement just made here by the representative of Pretoria attests to the fact that not only does South Africa persist and will continue to persist in its policy of aggression against Angola and against other front-line States, but also, ironic as this may be for the country of *apartheid*, it claims that its action against the legitimate Government of Angola is an action in favour of the so-called liberation of the Angolan people, a people for which the Pretoria representative has even claimed to speak here. This is no more and no less than brazenly overt imperialism.

110. The South African Government's internal and external policy of obstinancy and defiance of reason and

law creates an increasingly explosive situation in the southern part of the African continent, a situation that is without question seen as a threat to international peace and security.

111. The OAU, whose support for the cause of the liberation of Namibia, the cause of the struggle against *apartheid* in South Africa and the cause of solidarity with the front-line States is based on its constituent charter, once again appeals to international opinion, and in particular to the Governments of countries to which the Charter of the United Nations confers primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace in the world and to which South Africa continues to show its ill will and blind obstinacy. The Organization of African Unity, presided over by President Abou Diouf, whom I have the honour to represent here, echoes the call of African peoples addressed to the international community represented by the Security Council. It asks, must we wait for Pretoria to set ablaze the entire African continent before we consider that South Africa's actions endanger international peace and security and before taking appropriate measures?

112. The time has certainly come to respond to the legitimate aspirations of the African peoples and, beyond that, the peoples of the whole world, by taking the decision to condemn South African aggression against Angola and to implement global and mandatory economic sanctions, the only steps capable of bringing the leaders of Pretoria to reason. In so doing, the Security Council would be advancing the cause of human rights and peace in the world, fundamental aims of the Charter.

113. The Council is in duty bound fully to shoulder its responsibilities towards Angola, the front-line States and the international community in order to avoid a repetition of such actions. This would also be the occasion for the Council to determine ways and means to implement the relevant decisions of the United Nations on Namibia.

114. Mr. President, I finish as I began by thanking you and, through you, the Council as a whole for having given me the opportunity to address you in the name of the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity.

115. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Joseph Garba, Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

116. Mr. GARBA (Chairman, Special Committee against *Apartheid*): Mr. President, let me first of all thank you and members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to participate in this meeting on behalf of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. I should also like, on behalf of the Special Committee, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of September. The Special Committee and, indeed, the international community, look forward to the adoption by the Council under your leadership of meaningful measures against the criminal and aggressive régime of South Africa.

117. Once again the Security Council is meeting to consider the acts of aggression committed by the Pretoria régime against one of its neighbouring independent African States. It was as recently as 20 June that the Council adopted resolution 567 (1985) condemning the *apartheid* régime's criminal acts of aggression against Angola. On that occasion [*2596th meeting*], the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Angola told the Council that the South African régime's operation was a calculated effort to destabilize Angola and suffocate it economically. Earlier, in May, the Secretary-General issued a statement expressing concern at South Africa's military operation in Angola.

118. Since gaining independence a decade ago, Angola has been invaded by South Africa more than a dozen times. This and other acts of aggression by South Africa have been repeatedly and strongly condemned by the Security Council, which has demanded the immediate withdrawal of the invading South African forces and has affirmed the right to prompt and adequate compensation from South Africa. The Council has also requested Member States to extend all necessary assistance to the victims of South Africa's aggression.

119. Yet the Council's resolutions have not had the slightest impact on the *apartheid* régime. In June last, within the space of 48 hours, South Africa was condemned three times by the Security Council for its acts of aggression against Angola and Botswana and for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and installation of a so-called interim government in that Territory.

120. In May, the South African army tried to sabotage oil installations at Malongo, in Cabinda Province. A captured South African soldier then confessed that his unit had sabotaged other strategic installations in Angola. In the same month, Angolan authorities intercepted two South African night parachute drops of weapons to UNITA. All these criminal and dastardly acts took place despite the Lusaka understanding, which was signed in February 1984 between Angola and South Africa and which required the withdrawal of South African forces from Angola. South Africa's acts of aggression and the rebel UNITA attacks supported by South Africa have cost Angola billions of dollars, caused the deaths of tens of thousands of people, displaced hundreds of thousands others and devastated the country's economy.

121. Today, the South African army is still in Angola, purportedly in self-defence, but in reality subverting and destabilizing the Angolan Government. The Pretoria régime has dishonestly argued that it has launched a preventive action in self-defence because SWAPO was planning a campaign of terror in Namibia. A South African armoured battalion has gone 150 miles deep into Angola, accompanied by air strikes as far as 50 miles into the country and the bombing of Angolan forces which were attacking UNITA. The complicity of South Africa is demonstrated by the fact that a South African medical orderly was with the rebel UNITA forces when he was killed in the offensive by the Angolan troops against the UNITA rebels.

122. The South African régime has once again put forward the excuse of hot pursuit or pre-emptive action to justify its latest act of aggression. The right of self-defence is governed by Article 51 of the Charter, which can in no way be invoked by South Africa. There has been no threat to South African territory. On the contrary, South Africa has throughout been the source of aggression and destabilization against its neighbours. The question of self-defence or hot pursuit simply cannot arise in the present case. South Africa has no business in Angola. Its presence there has been declared illegal, repeatedly condemned by the Council and, indeed, is an infringement of international law.

123. This attack on Angola is not an isolated case. It is part of a deliberate policy of deceit and aggression aimed at destabilizing the neighbouring countries. Thus, the *apartheid* régime's acts of aggression and destabilization continue against Mozambique despite the Accord of Nkomati [*S/16451 of 30 March 1984, annex I*], South Africa has all along supplied weapons to the rebel national resistance movement. Just a few days ago, on 16 September, Mozambique's President confronted the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs with proof of the continued involvement of South Africa in the destabilization of Mozambique. President Samora Machel protested to Minister Botha about the serious and repeated violations of the Accord of Nkomati, which was supposed to be a peace agreement. The seriousness of the situation in Mozambique was discussed at meetings this year among southern African States. A few days ago, leaders of six front-line States met in Mozambique to consider the gravity of developments in South Africa.

124. The Lusaka understanding and the Accord of Nkomati were heralded by the racist minority régime as peace initiatives. But they have brought no peace, only more devastation. They were frauds, as are all other changes and so-called reforms offered by that régime, whose purpose is to mislead world public opinion. Now the veil has been lifted, and faced with irrefutable evidence, the racist Minister for Foreign Affairs was compelled to admit that South Africa had brazenly violated the Accord of Nkomati several times since it was signed in March 1984.

125. I hope that this will convince the major Western supporters of the racist régime that that illegal Government does not respond to rational and progressive initiatives.

126. I said at the meeting of the Council on 11 June last [*2585th meeting*] that no dialogue is possible with the Pretoria régime, which has all along defied the resolutions and calls of the United Nations, reneged on its undertakings, committed repeated acts of aggression and destabilization against its neighbours, is bent on perpetuating the criminal system of *apartheid* and continuously violates the Charter. The *apartheid* régime should be dealt with in the manner that it deserves.

127. The Security Council must now answer fittingly the Pretoria régime's defiance of all United Nations efforts towards the elimination of *apartheid*, the independence of Namibia and the maintenance of peace and security in southern Africa. It is long past the time to continue to repose hope in such policies as "constructive engagement" or "active engagement". The repeal of the Clark amendment can now be seen clearly as a tragic mistake.

128. For many years, the Special Committee has urged the adoption of concrete measures to combat the Pretoria régime's defiance of the United Nations and the international community. No longer should the Security Council delay the adoption of meaningful action under Chapter VII of the Charter. We have clearly seen that unless there is some effective pressure, internal or external, the *apartheid* régime shows no disposition to make the slightest move. Undoubtedly there is going to be no peace in southern Africa unless *apartheid* is eliminated and Namibia liberated.

129. The situation in South Africa is fast deteriorating. Not a day passes without blacks being killed by South African security forces; not a day passes without violence and brutality being inflicted on blacks. The emergency measures which were imposed on 20 July, giving unlimited powers to the policy and the army, have worsened a situation which was already irretrievable.

130. The United Nations has a special responsibility towards the peoples of South Africa and Namibia. This responsibility flows from the Charter. The need for effective international action is greater today than ever, particularly on this fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Security Council has no choice but to condemn racist South Africa, punish it, consistent with the Charter, and demand that that illegal Government render immediate and equitable reparations to the people of Angola. At a time when Member States are increasingly adopting sanctions against South Africa on an individual basis, the Security Council can do no less.

131. Mr. BASSOLÉ (Burkina Faso) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has already had an opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for September. I should like, however, to add my own congratulations and to vouchsafe to you my readiness to co-operate with you as you discharge your delicate functions. I take this opportunity also to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, who, as usual, presided over the Council with tact and competence.

132. In June 1985, racist South Africa added to its misdeeds the successive violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of two Member States, Angola and Botswana. The Council, whose faith and commitment to exercise its prerogatives under the Charter of the United Nations had been hurt, met and, with is customary wisdom, adopted appropriate resolutions designed to remedy the damage done to those two States and to prevail upon the Pretoria régime to respect the Charter of the United Nations, in the drafting of which the South African racist State may have participated.

133. Those resolutions, like the ones previously adopted by the Council in similar circumstances, had no effect on South Africa's blind and arrogant policy. Pretoria has just committed another act of defiance of the Council by again using force and violating once more the territorial sovereignty of Angola. It is therefore up to the Council, in all objectivity and wisdom, to determine the most appropriate means to meet this challenge. It is time—as we have constantly stated—to stop the South African racist régime in its folly. The Council's decisions must finally show the firmness which has so far been dramatically lacking because of an absence of cohesion within it.

134. The fallacious pretext of the right of hot pursuit, constantly invoked by Pretoria to justify the repeated violations of the Charter of which it has so often been guilty, should not sway the Council in its determination to put an end to these acts of aggression and to ensure and guarantee scrupulous respect for the Council Charter by the most appropriate means, specifically those available to it under the Charter.

135. The racist leaders of Pretoria, in the throes of an explosive internal situation, are seeking, in vain, to divert the international community's attention from the true problems faced by the régime of *apartheid* which they have institutionalized and which they intend to maintain at all costs. The Council should not pay attention to such delaying tactics. It is in duty bound not only to condemn the cowardly and barbarous act of aggression of which Angola has just been the victim, but also, and above all, to apply economic sanctions against Pretoria in order to do justice to the peoples of Angola and southern Africa whose dignity has been flouted.

*The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.*

---

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—January 1995—1,925